arXiv:1509.09162v2 [math.FA] 4 Oct 2016

SOME APPLICATIONS OF THE HÖLDER INEQUALITY FOR MIXED SUMS

N. ALBUQUERQUE, T. NOGUEIRA, D. NÚÑEZ-ALARCÓN, D. PELLEGRINO, AND P. RUEDA

Abstract. We use the Hölder inequality for mixed exponents to prove some optimal variants of the generalized Hardy–Littlewood inequality for m-linear forms on ℓ_p spaces with mixed exponents. Our results extend recent results of Araujo *et al.*

1. Introduction

Several extensions and generalizations of the famous Hölder's inequality have appeared along the time. One of these extensions is the Hölder inequality for mixed L_p spaces. This inequality seems to have been proved for the first time in 1961, by A. Benedek and R. Panzone [6], although its roots seem to go back to the work of W.A.J. Luxemburg [11]. Very recently, this inequality was rediscovered in Functional Analysis in a somewhat simplified form of an interpolative result (see [2, 3]). In this note we obtain an application of this Hölder inequality to the Hardy–Littlewood inequality for multilinear forms.

From now on, $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \ldots, i_m) \in \mathbb{N}^m$ is a multi-index. For scalar matrices $a^{(k)} = \left(a^{(k)}_{\mathbf{i}}\right)^n_{i_1,\ldots,i_m=1}$, $k = 1, \ldots, N$, we consider the coordinate product

$$a^{(1)} \cdot \ldots \cdot a^{(N)} := \left(a^{(1)}_{\mathbf{i}} \cdots a^{(N)}_{\mathbf{i}}\right)^n_{i_1,\ldots,i_m=1}.$$

The Hölder inequality for mixed sums is stated as follows (see also [1, Theorem 2.49]):

Theorem 1 (Hölder's inequality for mixed ℓ_p spaces)**.** *([11, 6]) Let $r_j, q_j(k) \in (0, +\infty]$, for $j = 1, \ldots, m,\ k = 1, \ldots, N$, be such that*

$$\frac{1}{r_j} = \frac{1}{q_j(1)} + \cdots + \frac{1}{q_j(N)}, \quad j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$$

and let $a^{(k)} = \left(a^{(k)}_{\mathbf{i}}\right)^n_{i_1,\ldots,i_m=1}$ be a scalar matrix for all $k = 1, \ldots, N$. Then

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^n \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^n |a^{(1)}_{\mathbf{i}} \cdot \ldots \cdot a^{(N)}_{\mathbf{i}}|^{r_m}\right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}} \ldots\right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}$$

$$\leq \prod_{k=1}^N \left[\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^n \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^n |a^{(k)}_{\mathbf{i}}|^{q_m(k)}\right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}(k)}{q_m(k)}} \ldots\right)^{\frac{q_1(k)}{q_2(k)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_1(k)}}\right].$$

As usual, for a positive integer N we define $\ell^N_\infty = \mathbb{K}^N$ endowed with the supremum norm ; by e_j we denote the canonical vectors which entries are 1 at j-th position and 0 otherwise. We define $X_p := \ell_p$, for $1 \leq p < \infty$, and $X_\infty := c_0$. For $\mathbf{p} := (p_1, \ldots, p_m) \in [1, +\infty]^m$ let

$$\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| := \frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m}.$$

We present a brief chronology of well known results concerning the "Hardy-Littlewood" inequality.

Key words and phrases. multiple summing operators, absolutely summing operators, Bohnenblust–Hille inequality.
D. Pellegrino is supported by CNPq.

Theorem (Bohnenblust–Hille inequality ([7], 1931)). *There exists a (optimal) constant $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\infty} \geq 1$ such that, for every continuous m–linear form $T : c_0 \times \cdots \times c_0 \to \mathbb{K}$,*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^{\frac{2m}{m+1}} \right)^{\frac{m+1}{2m}} \leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\infty} \|T\|. \tag{1.1}$$

Moreover, the exponent $\frac{2m}{m+1}$ is optimal.

Theorem (Hardy–Littlewood [10] and Praciano-Pereira [13] (1934 and 1981)). *Let $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. There exists a (optimal) constant $C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p}} \geq 1$ such that, for every continuous m-linear form $T : X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$,*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^{\frac{2m}{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}} \right)^{\frac{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}{2m}} \leq C^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p}} \|T\|. \tag{1.2}$$

Moreover, the exponent $\frac{2m}{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}$ is optimal.

Theorem (Hardy–Littlewood [10] and Dimant–Sevilla-Peris [9] (1934 and 2013)). *Let $\frac{1}{2} \leq \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| < 1$. There exists a (optimal) constant $D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p}} \geq 1$ such that*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_m=1}^{\infty} |T(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^{\frac{1}{1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}} \right)^{1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|} \leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p}} \|T\| \tag{1.3}$$

for every continuous m-linear form $T : X_{p_1} \times \cdots \times X_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$. Moreover, the exponent $\left(1 - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\right)^{-1}$ is optimal.

The Hardy Littlewood inequality for m-linear forms on ℓ_p spaces with mixed exponents and $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ was proved in [2, Theorem 1.2] (see also [2, p. 3729] for more details) and can be stated as follows:

Theorem 2 (Generalized Hardy–Littlewood inequality). *([2]) Let $m \geq 2$ be a positive integer, $\mathbf{p} := (p_1,\ldots,p_m) \in [1,+\infty]^m$ such that $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\mathbf{s} := (s_1,\ldots,s_m) \in \left[\left(1 - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\right)^{-1}, 2\right]^m$. The following assertions are equivalent:*
(a) There exists $D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{s},\mathbf{p}} \geq 1$ satisfying,

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n} \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n} |A(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^{s_m} \right)^{\frac{s_{m-1}}{s_m}} \ldots \right)^{\frac{s_1}{s_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{s_1}} \leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{s},\mathbf{p}} \|A\|. \tag{1.4}$$

for every continuous m-linear map $A : \ell^n_{p_1} \times \cdots \times \ell^n_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$ and all positive integers n.
(b) $\frac{1}{s_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{s_m} \leq \frac{m+1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|$.

In this paper we are mainly interested in what happens with (1.4) (and consequently with (1.1), (1.2) and (1.3)) when

$$\frac{1}{s_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{s_m} > \frac{m+1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|.$$

From the statement of Theorem 2 it is obvious that the constants involved will gain a dependence on n when smaller exponents are considered. We are mainly concerned in calculating the exact dependence on n depending on the new exponents.

In [4] a similar problem is considered having the "classical" Hardy–Littlewood inequality (when all exponents are the same). The main result of [4] is the following:

Theorem 3. *([4]) Let $m \geq 2$ be a positive integer.*

(a) If $(r,p) \in ([1,2] \times [2,2m)) \cup ([1,+\infty) \times [2m,+\infty])$, then there is a constant $D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,r,p} \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_m=1}^{n} |T(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,r,p} n^{\max\{\frac{2mr+2mp-mpr-pr}{2pr},0\}} \|T\|$$

for all m-linear forms $T : \ell_p^n \times \cdots \times \ell_p^n \to \mathbb{K}$ and all positive integers n. Moreover, the exponent $\max\{(2mr+2mp-mpr-pr)/2pr, 0\}$ is optimal.

(b) If $(r,p) \in [2,+\infty) \times (m,2m]$, then there is a constant $D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,r,p} \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_m=1}^{n} |T(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,r,p} n^{\max\{\frac{p+mr-rp}{pr},0\}} \|T\|$$

for all m-linear forms $T : \ell_p^n \times \cdots \times \ell_p^n \to \mathbb{K}$ and all positive integers n. Moreover, the exponent $\max\{(p+mr-rp)/pr, 0\}$ is optimal.

Remark 1. *Theorem 3 recovers the famous Bohnenblust–Hille inequality (see [7]) when $r = \frac{2m}{m+1}$ and $p = +\infty$. When $r = \frac{2mp}{mp+p-2m}$ and $p \geq 2m$ it is recovered the Hardy–Littlewood / Praciano-Pereira inequality (see [10, 13]). For $r = \frac{p}{p-m}$ and $m < p < 2m$ we get the Hardy–Littlewood / Dimant–Sevilla-Peris inequality (see [10, 9]).*

Remark 2. *It is worth noting that item (a) of the previous result holds for a more general situation: since Hölder's inequality is still valid for exponents between 0 and 1, we may have $r \in (0,1)$; also, following the lines of [4], we may consider a version with different values of p. More precisely, theorem 3 item (a) may be read as follows: let $m \geq 2$ be a positive integer and $\mathbf{p} = (p_1,\ldots,p_m)$. If $(r,\mathbf{p}) \in (0,2] \times [2,2m)^m \cup (0,+\infty) \times [2m,+\infty]^m$, then there is a constant $D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,r,\mathbf{p}} \geq 1$ (not depending on n) such that*

$$\left(\sum_{j_1,\ldots,j_m=1}^{n} |T(e_{j_1},\ldots,e_{j_m})|^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,r,\mathbf{p}} \cdot n^{\max\left\{\frac{m}{r}-\frac{m+1}{2}+\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|,0\right\}} \|T\|,$$

for all m-linear forms $T : \ell_{p_1}^n \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_m}^n \to \mathbb{K}$ and all positive integers n. Moreover, the exponent $\max\left\{\frac{m}{r}-\frac{m+1}{2}+\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|,0\right\}$ is sharp. In this situation, as expected, the exponent goes to $+\infty$ when r goes to 0.

For the sake of clarity we fix the following notation: for $\rho, r_1,\ldots,r_m \in (0,+\infty)$, let us define $M^{\rho}_{<} := \{j \in \{1,\ldots,m\} : r_j < \rho\}$, $M^{\rho}_{\geq} := \{1,\ldots,m\} \setminus M^{\rho}_{<}$. We shall denote by $|M^{\rho}_{<}|$ the cardinality of $M^{\rho}_{<}$. A particular case of ρ will be useful: $M^{\mathrm{HL}}_{<} := M^{2m/(m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|)}_{<}$.

Theorem 4. *Let $m \geq 2$ be an integer, $\mathbf{p} := (p_1,\ldots,p_m) \in [2,+\infty]^m$, and $\mathbf{r} := (r_1,\ldots,r_m) \in (0,+\infty)^m$. There exists a constant $D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p}} \geq 1$ such that for all positive integer n and for all bounded m-linear forms $T : \ell_{p_1}^n \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_m}^n \to \mathbb{K}$ the following inequality holds*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n} \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n} |T(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^{r_m} \right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}} \ldots \right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}} \leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p}} n^s \|T\|, \tag{1.5}$$

where the exponent s is given by:

1. *If $\mathbf{p} \in [2,2m]^m$ then, $s = \sum_{j \in M^2_{<}} \frac{1}{r_j} + \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| - \frac{1}{2}\left(|M^2_{<}|+1\right)$. When $M^2_{<} = \{1,\ldots,m\}$ the exponent s is optimal.*
2. *If $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ (in particular, if $\mathbf{p} \in [2m,+\infty]^m$) then, $s = \sum_{j \in M^{HL}_{<}} \frac{1}{r_j} - \frac{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}{2m} \cdot |M^{HL}_{<}|$. When $M^{HL}_{<} = \{1,\ldots,m\}$ or $M^{HL}_{<} = \emptyset$ the exponent s is optimal.*

Note that when $p_1 = \cdots = p_m = 2m$ in (1) and (2), the sets $M_<^{HL} = M_<^2$ coincide and so do both exponents s.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove Theorem 4 and leave some open problems to the interested reader. In Sections 3 and 4 we present a more general approach which provides slightly more general results than certain parts of Theorem 4.

2. The proof of Theorem 4

Let us recall a generalization of the Kahane-Salem-Zygmund inequality (see [2, 12]) that will be crucial to prove the optimality of the exponents:

Generalized Kahane–Salem–Zygmund. *Let $m, n \geq 1$, $(p_1, \ldots, p_m) \in [1, +\infty]^m$ and let us define*

$$\alpha(p) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}, \text{ if } p \geq 2; \\ 0, \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then there exist an universal constant C_m (depending only on m) and a m-linear map $A : \ell_{p_1}^n \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_m}^n \to \mathbb{K}$ of the form

$$A\left(z^{(1)}, \ldots, z^{(m)}\right) = \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_m = 1}^{n} \pm z_{i_1}^{(1)} \cdots z_{i_m}^{(m)},$$

such that

$$\|A\| \leq C_m \cdot n^{\frac{1}{2} + \alpha(p_1) + \cdots + \alpha(p_m)}.$$

From now on, $T : \ell_{p_1}^n \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_m}^n \to \mathbb{K}$ is an m-linear form.

2.1. **Case $\mathbf{p} \in [2, 2m]^m$.** Let us suppose that $M_<^2$ is non-empty. For the sake of clarity we shall assume that $M_<^2 := \{1, \ldots, k\}$. From Remark 2 for $r = 2$, we have

$$\left(\sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_m = 1}^{n} |T(e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_m})|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C n^{\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| - \frac{1}{2}}.$$

Let $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ be such that

$$\frac{1}{r_i} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{x_i} \qquad \text{for all } i = 1, \ldots, k.$$

Using Hölder's inequality for mixed sums (Theorem 1) and the classical inclusion for ℓ_p spaces we have

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n} \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n} |T(e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_m})|^{r_m} \right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}} \ldots \right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}$$

$$\leq \left(\sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_k = 1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i_{k+1}}^{n} \cdots \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n} \left|T(e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_m})\right|^{r_m} \right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}} \ldots \right)^{\frac{1}{r_{k+1}}2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n} \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{n} 1^{x_k} \right)^{\frac{x_{k-1}}{x_k}} \ldots \right)^{\frac{x_1}{x_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{x_1}}$$

$$\leq \left(\sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_m = 1}^{n} \left|T(e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_m})\right|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot n^{\frac{1}{x_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{x_k}}$$

$$\leq D_{m,(2,\ldots,2),\mathbf{p}}^{\mathbb{K}} \|T\| \cdot n^{\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| - \frac{1}{2}} \cdot n^{\frac{1}{x_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{x_k}}$$

$$= D_{m,(2,\ldots,2),\mathbf{p}}^{\mathbb{K}} \|T\| \cdot n^{\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{r_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{r_k} - \frac{k}{2}}$$

$$= D_{m,(2,\ldots,2),\mathbf{p}}^{\mathbb{K}} \|T\| \cdot n^{\sum_{j \in M_<^2} \frac{1}{r_j} + \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| - \frac{1}{2}\left(|M_<^2| + 1\right)}.$$

Now we prove the optimality. Let us consider the k-linear form $A_k : \ell_{p_1}^n \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_k}^n \to \mathbb{K}$ from the Kahane-Salem-Zygmund inequality given by

$$A_k(z^{(1)}, \ldots, z^{(k)}) = \sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_k=1}^{n} \pm z_{i_1}^{(1)} \ldots z_{i_k}^{(k)}$$

which fulfils

$$\|A_k\| \leq C_k n^{\frac{k+1}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_k}\right)}.$$

Let us define the m-linear form $B_m : \ell_{p_1}^n \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_m}^n \to \mathbb{K}$ by

$$B_m(z^{(1)}, \ldots, z^{(m)}) = A_k(z^{(1)}, \ldots, z^{(k)}) z_1^{(k+1)} \ldots z_1^{(m)}.$$

Clearly $\|B_m\| = \|A_k\|$. Also notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n} \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n} |B_m(e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_m})|^{r_m} \right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}} \ldots \right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}} \\
&= \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n} \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{n} |A_k(e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_k})|^{r_k} \right)^{\frac{r_{k-1}}{r_k}} \ldots \right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}} \\
&= n^{\frac{1}{r_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{r_k}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us suppose the result holds for some exponent $t > 0$. Then,

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n} \left(\ldots \left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n} |B_m(e_{i_1}, \ldots, e_{i_m})|^{r_m} \right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}} \ldots \right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}} \right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}} \leq C\|B_m\| \cdot n^t.$$

Since $p_j \geq 2$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$ we have

$$n^{\frac{1}{r_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{r_k}} \leq C\|B_m\| n^t \leq C C_k n^{t + \frac{k+1}{2} - \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_k}\right)}.$$

Thus, we obtain a lower bound for the exponent t that fulfills the result:

$$t \geq \frac{1}{r_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{r_k} + \left(\frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_k}\right) - \frac{k+1}{2} = \sum_{j \in M_<^2} \frac{1}{r_j} + \sum_{j \in M_<^2} \frac{1}{p_j} - \frac{|M_<^2| + 1}{2}.$$

When $M_<^2 = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, this lower bound coincides with the exponent we obtained before:

$$s = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{1}{r_j} + \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| - \frac{m+1}{2}$$

and, therefore, we gain the optimality for the exponent in this situation.

2.2. **Case $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$.** Similarly to the previous cases, we may suppose that $M_<^{\mathrm{HL}} := \{1, \ldots, k\}$ is non-empty. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_k > 0$ be such that

$$\frac{1}{r_i} = \frac{m + 1 - 2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}{2m} + \frac{1}{x_i}, \quad \text{for all } \ i = 1, \ldots, k.$$

Write $\rho_{\mathrm{HL}} := 2m/(m+1-2|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}|)$. Using Hölder's inequality for mixed ℓ_p spaces (Theorem 1), the canonical inclusion of ℓ_p spaces and the classical Hardy–Littlewood's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n}\left(\dots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n}|T(e_{i_1},\dots,e_{i_m})|^{r_m}\right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}}\dots\right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}\\
&\leq\left(\sum_{i_1,\dots,i_k=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{i_{k+1}=1}^{n}\left(\dots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n}|T(e_{i_1},\dots,e_{i_m})|^{r_m}\right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}}\dots\right)^{\frac{r_{k+1}}{r_{k+2}}}\right)^{\frac{\rho}{r_{k+1}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\rho}}\times\\
&\times\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n}\left(\dots\left(\sum_{i_k=1}^{n}1^{x_k}\right)^{\frac{x_{k-1}}{x_k}}\dots\right)^{\frac{x_1}{x_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{x_1}}\\
&\leq\left(\sum_{i_1,\dots,i_m=1}^{n}\left|T(e_{i_1},\dots,e_{i_m})\right|^{\frac{2m}{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}}\right)^{\frac{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}{2m}}\cdot n^{\frac{1}{x_1}+\dots+\frac{1}{x_k}}\\
&\leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,(\rho_{\mathrm{HL}},\dots,\rho_{\mathrm{HL}}),\mathbf{p}}\|T\|\cdot n^{\frac{1}{r_1}+\dots+\frac{1}{r_k}-\frac{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}{2m}k}\\
&\leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,(\rho_{\mathrm{HL}},\dots,\rho_{\mathrm{HL}}),\mathbf{p}}\|T\|\cdot n^{\sum_{j\in M^{\mathrm{HL}}_{<}}\frac{1}{r_j}-\frac{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}{2m}\cdot|M^{\mathrm{HL}}_{<}|}.
\end{aligned}$$

The optimality of the case $M^{\mathrm{HL}}_{<}=\{1,\dots,m\}$, which has exponent

$$s=\sum_{j=1}^{m}\frac{1}{r_j}+\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|-\frac{m+1}{2},$$

follows by the same argument of the previous item (a): a standard use of the m-linear form from the Kahane–Salem–Zygmund inequality. When $M^{\mathrm{HL}}_{<}=\emptyset$, we have $s=0$. Thus the optimality of the result is obvious since it is immediate that the inequality (1.5) does not hold if n^s is replaced by n^t with $t<0$.

Remark 3. *Maybe the lack of optimality in the above results is a lack of (to the best to the author's knowledge) a Kahane–Salem–Zygmund type inequality for this context. The optimality or not of the estimates of the previous propositions are, in our opinion, interesting open problems. In the next section, we will give a different approach to the case* $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\leq\frac{1}{2}$ *in Theorem 4(2), and get an inequality similar to (1.5) with optimal exponents* s.

3. Getting optimality

We have seen in the previous section that in the case $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\leq\frac{1}{2}$ we get optimality of the exponent s from (1.5) in the extreme cases $M^{\mathrm{HL}}_{<}=\{1,\dots,m\}$ or $M^{\mathrm{HL}}_{<}=\emptyset$. Let us see that we can also get optimality in the intermediates cases $0<|M^{\mathrm{HL}}_{<}|<m$ for a similar inequality (given in Theorem 5). The price we have to pay in order to gain optimality in these intermediate cases is double. First, the result is stated just for $r_1,\dots,r_m$ in the interval $[1,2]$ and not for all $r_1,\dots,r_m>0$. Second, the constant appearing in (3.1) depends a priori of the exponents $r_1,\dots,r_m$. Recall that the constant $D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p}}$ that comes from (1.5) does not depend on the r_i's.

We begin with an elementary lemma:

Lemma 1. *Let* $r_1,\dots,r_m\in(0,2]$, $m\geq 2$ *be a positive integer and* $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\leq\frac{1}{2}$. *If*

$$\frac{1}{r_1}+\dots+\frac{1}{r_m}>\frac{m+1}{2}-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|,$$

then there are $s_1,\dots,s_m \in \left[\left(1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\right)^{-1},2\right]$ *such that* $s_j \geq r_j$ *for all* $j=1,\dots,m$ *and*

$$\frac{1}{s_1}+\cdots+\frac{1}{s_m}=\frac{m+1}{2}-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|.$$

Proof. Note that since $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ we have

$$1<\frac{1}{1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}\leq 2.$$

We divide the proof in two cases:

First case. Suppose that $r_{j_0} \leq \left(1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\right)^{-1}$ for some j_0. In this case we define

$$s_j = 2 \text{ for all } j\neq j_0$$

and

$$s_{j_0}=\frac{1}{1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}.$$

Second case. Suppose that $r_j > \left(1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\right)^{-1}$ for all $j=1,\dots,m$. Note first that not all the r_j's are 2. Otherwise, we have $\frac{m}{2} > \frac{m+1}{2}-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|$, which contradicts $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Set $N:=\{j\in\{1,\dots,m\}: r_j<2\}$. So, $r_j=2$ for all $j\notin N$. If we replace every $r_j, j\in N$, by 2 then

$$\frac{m}{2}=\sum_{k\notin N}\frac{1}{r_k}+\sum_{k\in N}\frac{1}{2}\leq\frac{m+1}{2}-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|.$$

Let j_0 be the minimum $j\in N$ such that

$$\sum_{k\notin N}\frac{1}{r_k}+\sum_{\substack{k\in N\\ k<j_0}}\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}+\sum_{\substack{k\in N\\ k>j_0}}\frac{1}{r_k}\leq\frac{m+1}{2}-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|.$$

Then,

$$\sum_{k\notin N}\frac{1}{r_k}+\sum_{\substack{k\in N\\ k<j_0}}\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{r_{j_0}}+\sum_{\substack{k\in N\\ k>j_0}}\frac{1}{r_k}>\frac{m+1}{2}-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|.$$

By an Intermediate Value argument, there exists $\delta_{j_0}>0$ such that $s_{j_0}:=r_{j_0}+\delta_{j_0}\in\left[\left(1-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\right)^{-1},2\right]$ and

$$\sum_{k\notin N}\frac{1}{r_k}+\sum_{\substack{k\in N\\ k<j_0}}\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{r_{j_0}+\delta_{j_0}}+\sum_{\substack{k\in N\\ k>j_0}}\frac{1}{r_k}=\frac{m+1}{2}-\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|.$$

Hence, we take the s_j's as follows:

$$s_j:=\begin{cases} r_{j_0}+\delta_{j_0}, & \text{if } j=j_0;\\ 2, & \text{if } j\in N \text{ is such that } j<j_0;\\ r_j, & \text{if } j\notin N \text{ or } j\in N \text{ is such that } j>j_0.\end{cases}$$

□

As we have anticipated, the following theorem complements part (2) of Theorem 4:

Theorem 5. *Let* $m\geq 2$ *be an integer. If* $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\leq\frac{1}{2}$ *and* $\mathbf{r}\in[1,2]^m$*, then there is a constant* $D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{r},\mathbf{p}}\geq 1$ *(not depending on* n*) such that*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n}\left(\dots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n}|T(e_{i_1},\dots,e_{i_m})|^{r_m}\right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}}\dots\right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}\leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{r},\mathbf{p}}\cdot n^{\max\left\{\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{r}}\right|-\frac{m+1}{2}+\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|,0\right\}}\|T\|, \tag{3.1}$$

for all m-linear forms $T : \ell_{p_1}^n \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_m}^n \to \mathbb{K}$ and all positive integers n. Moreover, the exponent $\max\left\{\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{r}}\right| - \frac{m+1}{2} + \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|, 0\right\}$ is optimal.

Proof. The case

$$\frac{1}{r_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{r_m} \leq \frac{m+1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|,$$

is precisely Theorem 2. Let us suppose that

$$\frac{1}{r_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{r_m} > \frac{m+1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|,$$

and let $s_1, \ldots, s_m$ be as in Lemma 1. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ be such that

$$\frac{1}{r_i} = \frac{1}{s_i} + \frac{1}{x_i}, \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \ldots, m.$$

Using again Hölder's inequality for mixed ℓ_p spaces (Theorem 1) and the generalized Hardy–Littlewood inequality (Theorem 2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n}\left(\ldots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n}|T(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^{r_m}\right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}}\ldots\right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}\\
&\leq \left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n}\left(\ldots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n}|T(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^{s_m}\right)^{\frac{s_{m-1}}{s_m}}\ldots\right)^{\frac{s_1}{s_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{s_1}}\cdot\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n}\left(\ldots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n}1^{x_m}\right)^{\frac{x_{m-1}}{x_m}}\ldots\right)^{\frac{x_1}{x_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{x_1}}\\
&\leq D_{m,s,p}^{\mathbb{K}}\|T\|\cdot n^{\frac{1}{x_1}+\cdots+\frac{1}{x_m}}\\
&= D_{m,s,p}^{\mathbb{K}}\|T\|\cdot n^{\frac{1}{r_1}+\cdots+\frac{1}{r_m}-\left(\frac{1}{s_1}+\cdots+\frac{1}{s_m}\right)}\\
&= D_{m,s,p}^{\mathbb{K}}\|T\|\cdot n^{\max\left\{\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|-\frac{m+1}{2}+\frac{1}{r_1}+\cdots+\frac{1}{r_m},0\right\}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The optimality is proved as in the previous sections, using the Kahane–Salem–Zygmund inequality. □

Remark 4. *Whenever $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $1 \leq r_1, \ldots, r_m \leq 2m/(m+1-2|1/\mathbf{p}|)$ then we can apply both, Theorem 4 (2) and Theorem 5. The exponents we get in both cases coincide since in this case $M_<^{HL} = \{1, \ldots, m\}$.*

But there is still room to apply both results whenever $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and some of the r_j are between $2m/(m+1-2|1/\mathbf{p}|)$ and 2. On one hand, if all r_j are greater than or equal to $2m/(m+1-2|1/\mathbf{p}|)$ then $M_<^{HL}$ is empty and both exponent s are equal to 0 (as expected). On the other hand, if some of the r_j are bigger and some other are smaller than $2m/(m+1-2|1/\mathbf{p}|)$, we get different exponents, being the $s = s_5$ from Theorem 5 smaller than the exponent $s = s_4$ from Theorem 4, and so, better. Indeed, if $r_1, \ldots, r_m \in [1, 2]$ are such that $0 < k := |M_<^{HL}| < m$ then,

$$\sum_{j \in M_{\geq}^{HL}} \frac{1}{r_j} \leq \frac{m+1-2\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|}{2m}(m-k) = \left(\frac{m+1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right|\right)\left(1 - \frac{k}{m}\right),$$

and this inequality is equivalent to being $s_5 \leq s_4$.

4. Approach for $p_m \in (1, 2]$

The paper [5] fully describes several inequalities involving operators on ℓ_p spaces, some of which are useful for our purpose in this paper. For all positive integers m, $k = 1, \ldots, m$, let us define

$$\delta_{m-k+1}^{p_k,\ldots,p_m} := \frac{1}{1 - \left(\frac{1}{p_k} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m}\right)}.$$

The following is one of the main results from [5]:

Theorem 6. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a positive integer, $q_1, \ldots, q_m > 0$ and $1 < p_m \leq 2 < p_1, \ldots, p_{m-1}$ be such that $\left|\frac{1}{\mathbf{p}}\right| < 1$. The following assertions are equivalent:*
(a) There exists $C_{p_1,\ldots,p_m} \geq 1$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{+\infty}\left(\ldots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{+\infty}\left|A\left(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m}\right)\right|^{q_m}\right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}}\ldots\right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{p_1,\ldots,p_m}\|A\|$$

for all bounded m-linear operator $A : \ell_{p_1} \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$.

(b) The exponents $q_1, \ldots, q_m > 0$ satisfy

$$q_1 \geq \delta_m^{p_1,\ldots,p_m}, q_2 \geq \delta_{m-1}^{p_2,\ldots,p_m}, \ldots, q_{m-1} \geq \delta_2^{p_{m-1},p_m}, q_m \geq \delta_1^{p_m}.$$

The following Lemma is a variant from [5, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 2. *Let $p_1, \ldots, p_m \in [1, +\infty]$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_m, t_1, \ldots, t_m, s_2, \ldots, s_m \in (0, +\infty)$. Let us consider the following properties:*

(a) If there is $D_{p_2,\ldots,p_m} > 0$ such that, for all $(m-1)$-linear forms $A : \ell_{p_2} \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$,

$$\left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{n_2}\left(\sum_{i_3=1}^{n_3}\ldots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n_m}\left|A\left(e_{i_2},\ldots,e_{i_m}\right)\right|^{q_m}\right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}}\ldots\right)^{\frac{q_2}{q_3}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_2}} \leq D_{p_2,\ldots,p_m} n_2^{t_2}\cdot\cdots\cdot n_m^{t_m}\|A\|$$

holds, then $t_i \geq s_i$ whenever some property P_i is satisfied, for all $i \in \{2, \ldots, m\}$.

(b) If there is $C_{p_1,\ldots,p_m} > 0$ such that, for all m-linear forms $B : \ell_{p_1} \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$,

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n_1}\left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{n_2}\ldots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n_m}\left|B\left(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m}\right)\right|^{q_m}\right)^{\frac{q_{m-1}}{q_m}}\ldots\right)^{\frac{q_1}{q_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{q_1}} \leq C_{p_1,\ldots,p_m} n_1^{t_1}\cdot\cdots\cdot n_m^{t_m}\|B\|$$

holds, then $t_i \geq s_i$ whenever the property P_i is satisfied, for all $i \in \{2, \ldots, m\}$.

Then property (a) implies property (b).

We have an optimal result when $1 < p_m \leq 2$ and $p_1, \ldots, p_{m-1} > 2$:

Theorem 7. *Let $m \geq 2$, $\mathbf{r} := (r_1, \ldots, r_m) \in (0, +\infty)^m$ and $1 < p_m \leq 2 < p_1, \ldots, p_{m-1}$ with $\frac{1}{p_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p_m} < 1$. Then, there exists $D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}} \geq 1$ such that, for all positive integers $n_1, \ldots, n_m$ and for all bounded m-linear form $T : \ell_{p_1} \times \cdots \times \ell_{p_m} \to \mathbb{K}$,*

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n}\left(\ldots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n}\left|T\left(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m}\right)\right|^{r_m}\right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}}\ldots\right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}} \leq D^{\mathbb{K}}_{m,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}}\cdot\|T\|\cdot\prod_{k=1}^{m} n_k^{\max\left\{\frac{1}{r_k}-\frac{1}{\delta_{m-k+1}^{p_k,\ldots,p_m}},0\right\}}.$$

Moreover, the exponent $\max\left\{\frac{1}{r_m} - \frac{1}{\delta_1^{p_m}}, 0\right\}$ is optimal and, for each $k = 1, \ldots, m-1$, the exponent $\max\left\{\frac{1}{r_k} - \frac{1}{\delta_{m-k+1}^{p_k,\ldots,p_m}}, 0\right\}$ is optimal if $r_j \geq \delta_{m-j+1}^{p_j,\ldots,p_m}$ for $k+1 \leq j \leq m$.

Proof. Firstly, notice that when $r_k \geq \delta_{m-k+1}^{p_k,\ldots,p_m}$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, m$ we have precisely Theorem 6. Therefore, we may suppose that there is some exponent $r_j < \delta_{m-j+1}^{p_j,\ldots,p_m}$ and, for the sake of clarity, we may consider that this happens for all exponents. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_m > 0$ be such that

$$\frac{1}{r_k} = \frac{1}{\delta_{m-k+1}^{p_k,\ldots,p_m}} + \frac{1}{x_k}, \quad \text{for all } k = 1, \ldots, m.$$

By Hölder's inequality and Theorem 6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n_1}\left(\dots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n_m}|T(e_{i_1},\dots,e_{i_m})|^{r_m}\right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}}\dots\right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}\\
&\leq\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n_1}\left(\dots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n_m}|T(e_{i_1},\dots,e_{i_m})|^{\delta_1^{p_m}}\right)^{\frac{\delta_2^{p_{m-1},p_m}}{\delta_1^{p_m}}}\dots\right)^{\frac{\delta_m^{p_1,\dots,p_m}}{\delta_{m-1}^{p_2,\dots,p_m}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta_m^{p_1,\dots,p_m}}}\times\\
&\times\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n_1}\left(\dots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n_m}1^{x_m}\right)^{\frac{x_{m-1}}{x_m}}\dots\right)^{\frac{x_1}{x_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{x_1}}\\
&\leq C_{p_1,\dots,p_m}\|T\|\cdot n_1^{\frac{1}{x_1}}\cdot n_2^{\frac{1}{x_2}}\cdot\dots\cdot n_m^{\frac{1}{x_m}}\\
&\leq C_{p_1,\dots,p_m}\|T\|\cdot n_1^{\frac{1}{r_1}-\frac{1}{\delta_m^{p_1,\dots,p_m}}}\cdot n_2^{\frac{1}{r_2}-\frac{1}{\delta_{m-1}^{p_2,\dots,p_m}}}\cdot\dots\cdot n_m^{\frac{1}{r_m}-\frac{1}{\delta_1^{p_m}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

To obtain the optimality, we will proceed by induction on m. Initially we prove the case $m=2$. Let us suppose that there exist $t_1,t_2>0$ that fulfils

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_2}|U(e_i,e_j)|^{r_2}\right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}\leq D_{2,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbb{K}}n_1^{t_1}n_2^{t_2}\|U\|,$$

for all bounded bilinear forms $U:\ell_{p_1}\times\ell_{p_2}\to\mathbb{K}$, with $1<p_2\leq 2<p_1$ and $\frac{1}{p_1}+\frac{1}{p_2}<1$. By considering the bilinear form $T:\ell_{p_1}\times\ell_{p_2}\to\mathbb{K}$ given by $T(x,y)=x_1\sum_{j=1}^{n_2}y_j$, we have $\|T\|\leq n_2^{1-\frac{1}{p_2}}=n_2^{1/\delta_1^{p_2}}$. Then,

$$n_2^{\frac{1}{r_2}}\leq D_{2,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbb{K}}\cdot n_1^{t_1}n_2^{t_2}\|T\|\leq D_{2,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbb{K}}\cdot n_1^{t_1}n_2^{t_2}n_2^{1/\delta_1^{p_2}}.$$

Thus, making $n_2\to\infty$ we gain

$$t_2\geq\max\left\{\frac{1}{r_2}-\frac{1}{\delta_1^{p_2}},0\right\}.$$

Now let us prove the optimality of the exponent $\max\left\{\frac{1}{r_1}-\frac{1}{\delta_2^{p_1,p_2}},0\right\}$ of n_1 when $r_2\geq\delta_1^{p_2}$. The bilinear form $D:\ell_{p_1}\times\ell_{p_2}\to\mathbb{K}$ given by $D(x,y)=\sum_{j=1}^{n}x_jy_j$, satisfies $\|D\|\leq n^{1-\frac{1}{p_1}-\frac{1}{p_2}}=n^{1/\delta_2^{p_1,p_2}}$. If there exists t_1 such that

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_2}|U(e_i,e_j)|^{r_2}\right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}\leq D_{2,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbb{K}}n_1^{t_1}\|U\|,$$

holds for all n_1,n_2 and all bounded bilinear forms $U:\ell_{p_1}\times\ell_{p_2}\to\mathbb{K}$, then considering $n_1=n_2=n$, we get

$$n^{\frac{1}{r_1}}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}|D(e_i,e_j)|^{r_2}\right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}\leq D_{2,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbb{K}}n^{t_1}\|D\|\leq D_{2,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbb{K}}n^{t_1}n^{1/\delta_2^{p_1,p_2}}.$$

Thus, making $n\to+\infty$ we conclude the argument for $m=2$:

$$t_1\geq\max\left\{\frac{1}{r_1}-\frac{1}{\delta_2^{p_1,p_2}},0\right\}.$$

Now we suppose the result holds for all bounded $(m-1)$-linear forms. By induction hypothesis, if

$$\left(\sum_{i_2=1}^{n_2}\left(\sum_{i_3=1}^{n_3}\cdots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n_m}|A(e_{i_2},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^{r_m}\right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}}\cdots\right)^{\frac{r_2}{r_3}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_2}}\leq D_{p_2,\ldots,p_m}n_2^{t_2}\cdot\cdots\cdot n_m^{t_m}\|A\|$$

holds for all bounded $(m-1)$-forms $A:\ell_{p_2}\times\cdots\times\ell_{p_m}\to\mathbb{K}$, we have

$$t_m\geq\max\left\{\frac{1}{r_m}-\frac{1}{\delta_1^{p_m}},0\right\}$$

and

$$\forall\, k=2,\ldots,m-1,\ t_k\geq\max\left\{\frac{1}{r_k}-\frac{1}{\delta_{m-k+1}^{p_k,\ldots,p_m}},0\right\},\ \text{whenever } r_j\geq\delta_{m-j+1}^{p_j,\ldots,p_m},\,\forall\, j=k+1,\ldots,m. \tag{4.1}$$

Then we suppose that there exist $t_1,\ldots,t_m\geq 0$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n_1}\left(\ldots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n_m}|T(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^{r_m}\right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}}\ldots\right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}\leq D_{m,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbb{K}}\cdot n_1^{t_1}\cdot n_2^{t_2}\cdot\cdots\cdot n_m^{t_m}\|T\|. \tag{4.2}$$

for all bounded m-linear forms $T:\ell_{p_1}\times\cdots\times\ell_{p_m}\to\mathbb{K}$. By Lemma 2 we gain (4.1). It remains to prove the estimate for t_1 under the condition $r_j\geq\delta_{m-j+1}^{p_j,\ldots,p_m}$ for all $j=2,\ldots,m$, which means that we can take $t_2=\cdots=t_m=0$. Let us consider the m-linear form $D_m^n:\ell_{p_1}\times\cdots\times\ell_{p_m}\to\mathbb{K}$ defined by

$$D_m^n(x^{(1)},\ldots,x^{(m)})=\sum_{j=1}^{n}x_j^{(1)}x_j^{(2)}\cdots x_j^{(m)}.$$

Notice that $\|D_m^n\|\leq n^{1-\left(\frac{1}{p_1}+\cdots+\frac{1}{p_m}\right)}=n^{1/\delta_m^{p_1,\ldots,p_m}}$. By considering $n=n_1=\cdots=n_m$, from (4.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}n^{\frac{1}{r_1}}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|D_m^n(e_i,\ldots,e_i)|^{r_1}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}&=\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n_1}\left(\ldots\left(\sum_{i_m=1}^{n_m}|D_m^n(e_{i_1},\ldots,e_{i_m})|^{r_m}\right)^{\frac{r_{m-1}}{r_m}}\ldots\right)^{\frac{r_1}{r_2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{r_1}}\\&\leq D_{m,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbb{K}}\cdot n^{t_1}\cdot n^0\cdots n^0\|D_m^n\|\\&\leq D_{m,\mathbf{p},\mathbf{r}}^{\mathbb{K}}\cdot n^{t_1}\cdot n^{1/\delta_m^{p_1,\ldots,p_m}}.\end{aligned}$$

Taking $n\to+\infty$, we conclude the proof

$$t_1\geq\max\left\{\frac{1}{r_1}-\frac{1}{\delta_m^{p_1,\ldots,p_m}},0\right\}.$$

□

5. Final remark: the linear case

A natural question rises after all the case we dealt: *what is the behaviour of the linear case ($m=1$)?* On this situation, the result is clear and sharp: given a positive integer n, $p\in[1,+\infty]$ and $r\in(0,+\infty)$,

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n}|T(e_i)|^r\right)^{\frac{1}{r}}\leq n^{\max\left\{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{p'},0\right\}}\|T\|, \tag{5.1}$$

holds for all linear forms $T:\ell_p^n\to\mathbb{K}$, where p' denote the conjugate exponent of p. Moreover, the exponent $\max\left\{\frac{1}{r}-\frac{1}{p'},0\right\}$ is optimal. Indeed, when $r\geq p'$ (5.1) is obvious. When $r<p'$, (5.1) follows by Hölder's inequality, and the exponent optimality follows by the inclusions of ℓ_q spaces.

References

[1] R.A. Adams and J.J.F. Fournier, Sobolev spaces, Elsevier, Second Edition, 2003.

[2] N. Albuquerque, F. Bayart, D. Pellegrino and J. Seoane–Sepúlveda, Sharp generalizations of the multilinear Bohnenblust–Hille inequality, J. Funct. Anal. **266** (2014), 3726–3740.

[3] N. Albuquerque, F. Bayart, D. Pellegrino and J. Seoane–Sepúlveda, Optimal Hardy–Littlewood inequalities for polynomials and multilinear operators, Israel Journal of Mathematics, **211** (2016), 197-220.

[4] G. Araújo, D. Pellegrino, Optimal Hardy–Littlewood type inequalities for m-linear forms on ℓ_p spaces with $1 \leq p \leq m$, Archiv der Math. 105 (2015), 285–295.

[5] R. Aron, D. Núñez-Alarcón, D. Pellegrino and D. Serrano, Optimal exponents for Hardy-Littlewood inequalities for m-linear operators, arXiv:1602.00178v2 [math.FA] 11 May 2016.

[6] A. Benedek, R. Panzone, The space L_p, with mixed norm. Duke Math. J. 28 1961 301–324.

[7] H.F. Bohnenblust and E. Hille, On the absolute convergence of Dirichlet series, Ann. of Math. (2) **32** (1931), 600–622.

[8] W. Cavalcante, D. Núñez-Alarcón, Remarks on an Inequality of Hardy and Littlewood, to appear in Quast. Math.

[9] V. Dimant and P. Sevilla–Peris, Summation of coefficients of polynomials on ℓ_p spaces. Publ. Mat. 60 (2016), no. 2, 289–310.

[10] G. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood, Bilinear forms bounded in space $[p, q]$, Quart. J. Math. **5** (1934), 241–254.

[11] W.A.J. Luxemburg, Banach Function Spaces, Essen, 1955.

[12] A. M. Mantero and A. Tonge, The Schur multiplication in tensor algebras, Stud. Math. **68** (1980), no. 1, 1–24.

[13] T. Praciano-Pereira, On bounded multilinear forms on a class of lp spaces. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 81 (1981), no. 2, 561–568.

(N. Albuquerque) Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 58.051-900 - João Pessoa, Brazil.

E-mail address: ngalbqrq@gmail.com

(T. Nogueira) Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 58.051-900 - João Pessoa, Brazil.

E-mail address: tonykleverson@gmail.com

(D. Núñez) Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, 50.740-560 - Recife, Brazil.

E-mail address: danielnunezal@gmail.com

(D. Pellegrino) Departamento de Matemática, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 58.051-900 - João Pessoa, Brazil.

E-mail address: dmpellegrino@gmail.com and pellegrino@pq.cnpq.br

(P. Rueda) Departamento de Análisis Matemático, Universidad de Valencia, 46100 Burjassot, Valencia.

E-mail address: pilar.rueda@uv.es